

DRAFT MEETING NOTES
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Technical Advisory Group Meeting
August 6, 2007
Island Lake Community Center, Silverdale, WA

The meeting began at 9:30 AM. Introductions were made. In attendance were: Richard Brocksmitth, Doris Small, Jeff Heinis, Mark McHenry, Carrie Cook-Tabor, Hans Daubenberger, Micah Wait, Peter Bahls and Robin Lawlis.

The purpose of the meeting was to review final project applications, evaluate the technical merits, and determine a final, technically-ranked project list to be forwarded to the Habitat Project List Committee for review.

An updated agenda was distributed and reviewed. Richard said that the group will discuss funding availability before the end of the meeting to provide a framework, and that there may not be a need to discuss and “re-rank” every project in detail given we know that all the top 20 or so projects have funds available. We’ll cover questions on projects that remain near the cut-off line and below, especially those that are time sensitive and critical.

Richard gave an overview of the review process for normalizing and summarizing Independent Technical Scores, which is the same as previous years. Richard distributed a list of projects ranked with normalized scores and rankings with raw scores. Independent technical scores were received from eight TAG members, with a ninth member providing a review that wasn’t included in the interim technical ranking due to late submittal of those scores.

Richard displayed a general list of final applications submitted to the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) Lead Entity for 2007 SRFB Grant Round showing dollar amounts. He also distributed a final funding allocation table summarizing dollars for the 15 watersheds in the Puget Sound. There are two pots, SRFB Round 8 Funds (Chum and Chinook), \$1.568 million; 5% of the SRFB funds are allocated to Chum and we get 13/16 of that based on an April agreement with NOPL. Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration funds (recommended by the PS Partnership and provided by the Governor and Legislature) are slightly more complicated in that we agreed (April meeting with NOPL and May Salmon Recovery Council agreement) to work with NOPL to produce one Chum list, thus the final dollar amount is currently unknown. The second half of the chart, Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Funds, reflects those funds and that 5% for summer chum. The numbers are generally similar to SRFB funds in percentages and spread out over 15 Lead Entities. We know we have \$4.742M for chinook salmon and Richard assumed we have a Chum allocation of over \$2 million, pending final agreement with NOPL. That provides around \$6.8 million total to distribute, with a need to cull out around \$1.6 million. Capacity funds have been pulled out of that funding account, with which we will hire someone at the HCCC (September 2007) to track projects and plan funding strategies, etc. By the end of the meeting we’ll discuss cumulative costs and two

separate lists of projects we can forward; one for Chum and one list for Chinook and Bull Trout. Of the 26 projects, we might have to pull some for another funding source or year.

Richard handed out the interim technically-ranked list and project scores, provided below. The current temporary line is between Port Townsend Bay Shoreline Acquisition and Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition.

Interim Rank	Project Name	Species	SRFB Request	Cumulative
1	Skokomish Estuary Island Restoration	Chinook**	\$1,012,100	\$1,012,100
2	WDFW Big Quilcene Estuarine Dike Removal	Both	\$75,000	\$1,087,100
3	Pope Headwaters Conservation Nearshore Juvenile Salmon Assessment	Chum	\$550,000	\$1,637,100
4	Upper South Fork Skokomish LWD Phase 2	Chum	\$103,464	\$1,740,564
5	Right Smart Cove Acquisition and Restoration	Bull Trout	\$389,300	\$2,129,864
6	Ward Property Acquisition in Quilcene Bay	Both	\$80,000	\$2,209,864
7	Salmon Estuary Wood Waste Removal	Both	\$255,025	\$2,464,889
8	Snow/Salmon Riparian 2007 Duckabush Robinson Road	Both	\$642,243	\$3,107,132
9	Levee Removal	Chum	\$185,692	\$3,292,824
10	Skokomish General Investigation	Both	\$99,400	\$3,392,224
11	Lower Dosewallips Estuary and Floodplain Restoration	Chinook	\$596,150	\$3,988,374
12	Mid-Hood Canal Acquisition	Both	\$202,000	\$4,190,374
13	Dosewallips & Duckabush Engineered Log Jam Design	Both	\$537,999	\$4,728,373
14	Skokomish Confluence Reach Restoration Design	Chinook	\$599,140	\$5,327,513
15	Vance Creek Design	Chinook	\$445,126	\$5,772,639
16	Big Quilcene LWD Phase 2	Chinook	\$130,000	\$5,902,639
17	Five Mile Creek LWD	Chum	\$442,300	\$6,344,939
18	Chimacum Creek S-Curve Conservation	Chinook	\$30,000	\$6,374,939
19	Port Townsend Bay Shoreline Acquisition	Chum	\$96,347	\$6,471,286
20	Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration	Both	\$500,000	\$6,971,286
21	Skokomish Knotweed Inventory and Treatment	Both	\$693,186	\$7,664,472
22		Chinook	\$80,611	\$7,745,083

23	Noxious Weed Survey for Lower and Mid-HC	Chum	\$143,750	\$7,888,833
24	WRIA 16 BMP Implementation	Chinook	\$216,400	\$8,105,233
25	Marine Riparian Initiative	Both	\$107,200	\$8,212,433
	Twanoh Falls Community Club			
26	Bulkhead Removal	Both	\$246,000	\$8,458,433
			\$8,458,433	

Richard discussed conflicts of interests for the scoring process and the group agreed to proceed using all scores except those where the scorers were associated with the project sponsors.

We normalize to address scoring bias, not scorer bias, because different scorers score differently. That is fine as long as each scorer is consistent with their own list. We normalize to offset the bias and it has worked for the past 6 years. The “bin” process for project reviewing was discussed. We agreed to focus on the projects on the “bubble” (approximately project Nos. 14-21). The top 14 projects are required to move salmon recovery forward and the group is fine with where everything is, so that “bin” was accepted.

ESRP money could cover some of these projects, but it’s too early to tell. Richard said he would do due diligence and update the project costs if new money became available. Knotweed could be a good project for WDFW. There was a general discussion about inventory and control of knotweed, with a consensus for the need but that a more integrated effort needed to move forward focusing on one year at a time.

Richard displayed and the group discussed 2007 comments from the SRFB Review Panel. NMI means that the project sponsor needs to provide more information and PPOC means preliminary project of concern. For each project they look at preliminary project of concern according to SRFB criteria and the reasons why and then provide comments.

Next a group evaluation of individual projects from top to bottom was done. Beginning at the top of the list, Richard reviewed SRFB Review Panel Comments and technical details to make sure there are no problems.

No. 1--Skokomish Estuary Island Restoration—Review Panel want more information on elements and cost. Projects details are lacking, but feasibility funds and base funds are ready.

No. 2—WDFW Big Quilcene Estuarine Dike Removal: Review Panel report stated more information is needed. Clarify costs and need for beach nourishment. Provide justification for total dike removal vs. partial removal. Justify tidal channel reconstruction vs. allowing natural tidal process. Clarify footage.

No. 3--Pope Headwaters Conservation. Which streams and what buffers sizes were included. The language doesn’t match up with the drawing. They are including associated

tributaries. Richard explained background with Pope Resources who is interested in selling rights to cut the timber and in selling development rights. Also a factor is cutting rights. They are discussing a 200 ft. buffer. Nicole Hill is a new person at CLC. Richard met with her about the No Cut and No Development areas on the map and the headwaters and tributary pieces. A new map should be produced to show Courtney Creek in green (No Cut area) as well, given it's ability to support summer chum spawning. They currently have a 50 ft. No Touch and a 50-100 ft. where they can manage the buffer. They appraise the value of the timber that is legally harvestable. Part of the appraisal process is what is protected and what value is out 200 ft. We want to make sure they have the right set of tributaries (in green for their discussion with Pope), so we need to make sure Courtney Creek is included. Does the Lead Entity want to make recommendations about the buffers? Pope will have the logging road maps. The TAG was consistent in recommending that if we purchased development rights, then Pope should not be able to transfer development rights, which Richard was asked to verify. Would SRFB funds be used for buffers? Yes. How many green corridors should there be and how extensive? This is what SRFB money is for. Richard asked for a consensus about the amount of green. Should they look for minor tributaries? We don't want to handicap them so that when they go to Pope, it's a non-starter. Match is in hand. There were no problems with Review Panel on this one.

No. 4--Nearshore Juvenile Salmon Assessment. The Review Panel didn't review this because application wasn't ready at the time. Are there any comments on this project? The concern is that the first year is a pilot project and it's not specific about study, wants contract with scope of work for someone, or think about it with technical committee about what kind of study we want to do; Peter Bahls thought it may be premature at this point. Richard said there is a set of project objectives, including specific pilot objectives (provide models, context, approach and framework for implantation and protocols) and task list (focus on protocols for capturing and marking fish), which were thoroughly developed and laid out in the application. You can mark a lot of fish, but difficult to recapture. We wanted to make sure this is doable, and not utilize too much money, thus the pilot approach. They don't decide a contract until December, but fish come out in January, so it may have to go a year later. Richard said if the money is late and they can't get it done, then we can use money for developing protocols on fall chum and then have time to develop a program for the following year (we need to apply for permits now but we have some in hand that will need some modification). The timing is an important point and will need a staff collaborative committee to formalize long-term research questions and conceptual model to finalize year one scope of work. Peter: It sounds like we need a year to figure out with the group what we want to do and asked if it would be Fall 2008 for those fish. We need to focus on objectives and answer Nearshore questions now. Doris: You'd get more than talk. Peter: Get people who have done Chum work to see if it's feasible; amount of fish is huge. Richard said initial discussions were had with experts, and more would follow. Simenstad liked it generally, but thought that it is ambitious; he is excited to work through ideas of how we'd do it. Well come back to this after we review the full list.

No. 5--Upper South Fork Skokomish LWD Phase II: There was a question about projection forecasts for natural recruitment and how much time we need to keep that

system going on life support before it starts recruiting on its own since it's a big chunk of money? Above the creek clearing LWD recruitment is fair to good. There are chunks of riparian in upper watershed fairly intact from Browns Creek on and wood log jams on an upward trajectory. Richard said there is a lot of smaller wood coming into the system. Review Panel comments were that Riparian planting and maintenance is needed (where/how?). They low balled cost. It needs to be done with more thought into it. They want specific sites, but so does Lead Entity, but projects can't be 90% detailed; it's a conceptual proposal. We'll respond with more information. Peter: What about enhancing Phase I? Loading projects more than construction—we're still taking geomorphic surveys, which will be done this month for Phase I and sources for wood are being identified. Budget from phase 1 was \$190,000 plus match of wood from Forest Service and a match for Fish and Wildlife. Helicopter for trees, but with limits to what they can carry. Had to go back and create a new plan—no stamps on the drawings, but same process. There are access sites to haul, but still need helicopter to bring wood to staging areas to move it around (2.5 miles of river in the worst shape, four jams but need minimum of 12 to meet objective)—we don't have enough money. This would free up money from Phase I to do a watershed analysis. It's the actual construction of engineering log jams in Holman Flats.

No. 6--Right Smart Cove Acquisition and Restoration. Review Panel indicated need for a cultural resource review and expand planting area around the cove. We hope to find a way around to do that if land owners would cooperate, which they will if it benefits them long term. Expand buffer behind building 20 ft. Wawa Point Rd. and Hjelvicks Road, Rt. 101 is the riparian planting site--20 acres, plus water/beach. Parks is going to purchase it for stewardship and conservation purposes. There is a structure restricting tides. It could be undone in an afternoon. Is the structure on private property or state park land? Either way it's illegal and should be removed.

No. 7--Ward Property Acquisition in Quilcene Bay. Viewed Quilcene Bay Ward map. Owner is concerned and wants to be bought out rather than be affected. It's salt marsh, mud flats and gravel beaches. It runs along other currently protected property.

No 8--Salmon Estuary Wood Waste Removal. Issue of how much we have to excavate and disposal of material. Compost is one option, with money in budget to hire excavator to do it, which is cheaper than hauling. Estimate needs to be nailed down, includes haul. Site identified for disposal, but not big enough, need 10 acres so a second site is being identified. You can't use Puget Sound monies to match SRP monies, but you can use SRP state money to match federal SRFB. The match is fine. Some of these projects will find out they got ESRP in the next week once a list comes out. Richard asked sponsors to look at budgets, in some cases, dollars will go down, and in some they have counted on that money. In no case will some drop off the list (some will just decrease in cost depending upon how they prepared their budget).

No. 9—Snow/Salmon Riparian. The project is to install riparian livestock fencing, crossing bridge, and watering facility, and plant 19 acres. This got a ding from one reviewer, but not significant. Just finished doing an acquisition, currently limited or no buffers and needs more. Question about proposal to pay for bridge over Salmon Creek for the cattle, but was done several times in Chimacum. It seems it could be funded under

farm project sources. One of the five sections is state (F&W), others private individuals. 180 feet increments or less in each. State should plant floodplain and use CREP(?) money for other. No problem with Review Panel.

No. 10--Duckabush Robinson Road Levee Removal: Review Panel: PPOC (preliminary project of concern). Set-back levee could be a significant cost and it should have been factored in, plus constructability. They talked to the neighbors (some of the descendents of Robinson) and they were fine with removing the levee, but we still need to do an analysis. On the levee the Review Panel said that information is not sufficient to determine need for or benefit of the project. High cost relative to anticipated benefits and have not justified costs. Design is not adequate or the project is improperly sited. We need answers on berm and tighter cost; ESRP pays 2/3 and we pay 1/3, less than \$100,000.

No. 11—Skokomish General Investigation. Many in the group considered this and Vance Creek assessment and design and Confluence Reach assessment and design as an investment in the future. Skokomish recovery plan puts a lot of weight on the GI and if they don't complete that we have to rethink the entire process of the salmon recovery plan in Skokomish. Phase I feasibility has been completed, phase II to develop project alternatives, phase III proposes to complete preliminary engineering and environmental review on alternatives. Wants more information on how the projects at Nalley Island and the car body levee are being considered within the completion of the GI and include how the GI for the Skokomish integrates with the Vance Creek assessment.

No. 12--Lower Dosewallips Estuary and Floodplain Restoration: Review Panel rated NMI; needs more complete cost estimate and goals and objectives measurements. Reviewed map. Area of rip rap removal is protected, campsites need to be moved out of floodplain, but need to make sure if we take it out that the river will reclaim it. Question: What do we expect sediment of shellfish beds if we take dikes out (most are north of that) and other questions on this were discussed. It seems that upper dike has a campground road that goes along there and if that became the floodplain, would the riparian go up against that road? You would lose some, yes, but limited portion. It's feasibility for larger project and the highlighted part of the map will be taken out during this phase. Rip rap removal--reviewed breakdown of cost.

No. 13--Mid-Hood Canal Acquisition: Technical Committee scores deviated and project ended in the 13th place. Review Panel: NMI--Needs more information, partial maps, and restoration activity to be completed. They have a question about how they want to maintain the land and who is going to do that. Question about price of land vs. how developable it is. Numbers are not unreasonable. What is purpose of purchasing the upland part, Crowell property? Some reviewers hadn't understood the amount of floodplain, side channel, and slope in this area. It would be a boundary line adjustment. Are they planning to turnover to state parks (see map, area in red)? Owners not opposed to land going to conservation. There's also the 40 acre Pope inholding, which is where they will probably put camp a ground, though that is currently proposed. The access road crosses the side channel. \$20,000 to buy an easement to Crowell property for permanent access to site.

No. 14—Dosewallips and Duckabush Engineered Log Jam Design. This is a preliminary project of concern. The Review Panel wanted to know about money for consultants (designing engineering log jams and costing out) and salaried staff (for geomorphic work). Mike Ramsey, IAC, said they didn't understand its large scale and now realizes it covers 18 miles. There will be more topics to discuss as we move ahead. There may need to be some private land to be included with the Duckabush. Most is on-the-ground costs (some aerial photos are needed). We can move time budgeted to that to other locations. Ted Labbe's study that identified reaches of conservation has been done already and that's what we used. Two groups who have a need for engineered plans—sponsor and landowner. Do we need engineered log jams with stamps or is there another alternative? Group likes approach of not engineering; that is, not stamping everything, to stretch out money. No match. With the Dose most of the sites are below the washout. We don't want wood to wash downstream and get cut by the locals and create a perception of possible property damage, so we need to build jams large enough that will stay. Cost is based on five designs we had to pay for downstream and other considerations. You could start on one river/watershed (the Dosewallips) so that there's less time between analysis and design so you are closer to the truth. We need to look at critical things on the list that need to happen, and this design is one of them. If we cut one river out it wouldn't cut cost in half.

No. 15--Skokomish Confluence Reach Restoration Design: Ownership was uncertain, thus it got a PPOC. Now both potential owners have agreed to move forward. Refer to map—Richert Ranch is critical for restoration, the best place in the entire valley—this proposal would do design in two years, regardless. May need 20-40 jams in addition to levee removal. It's the right approach. CMZ map shows details.

No. 16—Vance Creek Design: The sponsor wants to direct a consultant to figure out what's wrong with it, work it out with the GI. What about lumping the projects together since assessments are similar? The Vance Creek isn't as robust as the other two and not enough funds being asked for to roll it in. There's \$130,000 to cover 10 miles but they're focusing on lower four miles—more look and feel and pick one or two projects they can do and design out. We want confluence to roll into the GI, whereas with Vance there would be the same approach but not necessarily fill all those gaps. The way it's written the tribe can go individually or with the GI, if other funding can stretch that far. It would take longer with the GI. It's a policy decision they would have to make at the Skokomish Council level after being briefed by the Natural Resources staff.

No. 17--Big Quilcene LWD Phase 2: Review Panel comments: Preliminary project of concern. Depends on other key conditions, no account for conditions is watershed, may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, design is not adequate or may be improper sites, unlikely that the project will achieve stated goals. Focus of concern for RP was the levee, but they didn't realize the proposal didn't propose to put jams in the levee reach. Proposal is for three jams and four log control structures at the top of the ridge. They are \$120,000 each for the control structures, which seemed high. Referred to map of potential property acquisition by Skokomish Tribe. If this is successful, they will combine Phases 1 and 2, as Phase 1 may not be built this summer. We walked the property to the levee. Some of the jams are connected to the dike, which is a factor for scoring. What are they going to do differently with the jams that have been blown out? It wasn't keyed in

because of bedrock and it blew out. There were lessons to be learned from it even though the channel aspect wasn't successful; the jam did what it was supposed to do. They do assessment this year to answer questions in the future. \$120,000 a piece for log control that engineering has already (mostly) done. Plus log jams and engineering costs so this becomes an issue.

No. 18—Five Mile Creek LWD—seems like a lot of work done for a small amount of money. It's surprising it came out so low on the project list. Michelle Kramer thought they needed to add another log jam up on the creek. \$30,000 SRFB. Review Panel needs more information. Include in proposal a revegetation plan and cabin if it's to be removed. Work with landowner to curtail dumping of yard waste on the bank. Consider riparian planting. See photo: The pool formed in project area adjacent to bank--scour from ELJ's will complete these channel connections. Cabin removal is not required to make project successful.

No. 19—Chimacum Creek S-Curve Conservation. Nothing from the SRFB RP given they didn't go to see the site. Refer to map: with topography point of view there is a steep ravine, which is in good shape, but if people buy at the top and clear, then it could be affected. They want to buy up S-Curve properties. The point was made that a huge amount of work has been completed here already and these parcels are the next logical step. Heavily wooded, good jams, steep slopes and since it's on top of a ridge, it would be easy to come in and put up a house.

Two big conservation projects: Port Townsend and Tarboo-Dabob, which have been closely scored. We need to discuss the merits of both projects. Tarboo-Dabob is \$700,000 with \$300,000 matching.

Project 20—Port Townsend Bay Shoreline Acquisition. With Port Townsend it's more upland than Tarboo-Dabob, and much more development opportunity. See map of Old Fort Townsend State Park Acquisition Project Vicinity. The mill owns most of the land and it's where they dump their fly ash, which is OK by EPA. Includes 25 acres of eel grass. Biggest thing this will buy is the development rights for 50 houses, which will be in forestry with some long-term wasting of fly ash. The point was raised that the tidelands and bluff are protected by SMP already, so what could they do to harm it? Others brought up that long-term cumulative impacts are certain with up to 50 houses that could be built. If they are going to protect the bluff why not more than 200 feet with purchase and development rights? Cost for easements is inexpensive, less for tidal than development. \$250,000 for 4,000 feet of shoreline. If it's protected, what are we getting for it? State parks for public access. Our \$500,000 is buying the bluff and development rights for salmon. It's a small part of the whole budget. They don't have the rest of the money yet, applied through ESRP grant and have applied for coastal wetland grant. Their purchase option expires in July 2008.

Project 21—Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration. Fee simple purchase of uplands and half interest in tidelands. Nature conservancy bought a half interest in tideland and the other half is owned by an oyster grower, a split interest. Buy other half so it goes to TNC or DNR. Purchase of tidelands won't restrict recreational shell fishing just

degrading structures. Match is broad spit donation from county (Notice of Grant Agreement). Road decommissioning is a complex project. County commissioners are supportive but in another year or two they may not be the same people involved in the project. Same question applies here as to what are we getting if we're buying the tidelands, beyond existing SMP? It is used for commercial tidelands, useful for shellfish habitat so you are controlling, but with the Port Townsend project it's not being used for that, maybe down the road. We want to make sure it's conserved for Summer Chum—off limits to commercialized shellfishing, etc. Ranked low because of inland road that is trashed, a lot of money for a property heavily impacted. Benefit low for cost, with the major benefit being the ability to restore the feeder bluff instead of losing it permanently. This may be true, but that's why it's a good restoration project. One house site vs. Port Townsend Bay with 50 houses. But a lot of design and analysis has already been done without SRFB funds—a lot of work went into this area. We have to ask when has the benefit reached the cost? But flip side, if we don't buy site before house is built, then that bulkhead will never go away. We need to ask if the drift cell is worth \$700,000, and if this one bulkhead has enough of a footprint to affect the drift cell significantly for salmon.

With both projects it's not worth money to buy tidelands if they can't provide anymore protection than currently exists. It only makes sense if you're getting something for salmon out of it.

General Discussion:

We want to leave several additional projects on the bottom of the list for now as a funding buffer in case some projects higher on the list have to wait (Right Smart Cove which is in negotiation). Tribal Council said the Upper Skokomish LWD project needs match by August 15, 2007 or it will be pulled per Carrie Cook-Tabor.

Our process must focus on prioritizing the best projects, then when we have a list, we can see about species and pots of money to fund all.

Keep projects 1-14 as is and prioritize projects 15-21. Peter has a project ready to go with others still in the beginning stages. We don't want to miss opportunities that are ready. We need to balance. When asked about the prevalence of studies this year, Richard calculated that there is \$2.1 million proposed out of \$8 million for studies/assessments. It's 27.5% for assessments of projects above the line. Can we do without any of these? Some are necessary to move forward and are essential. Are any as time sensitive as the Tarboo-Dabob project? Are they all more strategic?

The Confluence Reach or GI can not afford to wait for another year. The GI is hard to change; there is money that can be stripped from the Confluence Reach possibly. That can be said of most of the projects; we don't need all of it today. Any funded by ESRP we can look at how much we can strip off—it's our job to do due diligence once we get the prioritized list. One reviewer asked if the Tribe has the capacity to handle all of these projects. The Tribe believes they have the capacity to handle these projects with staff in hand and will move forward when the funds are available. Question on general investigation, project manager is \$110,000 half of an FTE, is it really \$220,000 a year or is

that for two years? If two, then number of FTE's should be changed (Richard made a note of this).

The Big Quilcene Wood project seems like it could wait, it's not time sensitive. That's one scenario. Can we technically justify the change? Go with protection rather than restoration, although not all actions are equal. Tarboo-Dabob is a portfolio for ecosystem protection; it's a good project, but not necessarily for salmon. It's got salmon value benefit on the spit part of it especially. Forage fish drives habitat. Quilcene is a critical Summer Chum watershed. The supplement program is sunsetting and we need to increase habitat capacity so the run can support itself naturally. Phase I funds have not yet been spent (ran into a Steelhead problem)—approximately \$350,000. If there are unspent funds, then some members of the TAG felt less bad about delaying it for another year. They also don't have match money in hand for Phase II. The same applies to Right Smart Cove regarding the absolute need to do the restoration this year. We could look at that aspect for others. Are there other projects to move down with Big Quilcene? Perhaps Mid-Hood Canal, but now we think those are better purchases—we're buying into a process with that with the County's flood plain management plan movement. Hesitate on wood waste removal—it will happen in 2008. How deep we dig, 10 or 12 ft., is the only issue, a professional did all of the analysis, just need final details pulled together. Re: planning studies at one time, Vance Creek, Skokomish, we think they are worthwhile and required investments. The nearshore assessment could lead to prioritizing thousands of other projects that could benefit salmon.

Richard will write up an agreement with project sponsors that they won't go to SRFB until they have their projects in hand so that the money can just slide down the list, if group approves. Peter suggested flipping Tarboo-Dabob Bay and Port Townsend. A recent change SRFB made is that funding goes down the list if the project falls out. Is Chimacum Creek time sensitive? They've already purchased and are ready to go. Peter's concern is that this project is ready to go, that they have a purchase agreement that's guaranteed, and then he has to drop the agreement if it doesn't get funded, and if so, they've lost \$20,000 earnest money. If it will be funded then they'll keep their option there to prevent others from buying—their match has been taken care of, they just need more security. Can they move Port Townsend below Big Quilcene? Need side by side comparison of shoreline and tideland, forest land with each project, how much is easement. 45 acres of impact tideland with Port Townsend and 20 with Tarboo-Dabob plus 30 acres upland ownership Port Townsend and over 175 acres in conservation easement (refer to application). Then 50 houses in Port Townsend site vs. one. The Chimacum property is 3 acres. Dosewallips has 11 acres. Mid-Hood Canal is 16 acres (\$25,000 an acre, same as Peter's). Richard's technical, individual opinion is that he would weigh Port Townsend Bay higher. Carrie would rank it higher too, and so would Doris.

Richard asked the group about what else is time critical. Look at specific proposals we should do that we can support from a technical basis. One concern about big study projects. It's a lot of money if they aren't done right or don't pan out, it's money that could have gone elsewhere.

No reason not to move Big Quilcene. Carrie: What about pairing down Big Quilcene project to be in the zone, log jams, berms and what to do--it seemed premature. The group viewed the map and discussed further particulars of the project. Big Quilcene less time sensitive, some questions, haven't done enough to address our concerns on levee setbacks, they do have Phase I funds to move forward over next year focusing on what they have now.

Peter: Propose moving Vance Creek below Big Quilcene because large number of assessments--this is least critical, and in terms of benefits, success and time sensitivity, it's less than the others. Richard wants to leave as is. Carrie wants as is. Doris wants as is.

Jeff: Propose to accept the list the way it was originally scored.

Peter's not confident that all of these assessments will get done. Since there's a lot of money, people are getting assessments ready now but the problem is that it's cutting projects. Response: At a 27% assessment rate it's not a lot. There are a lot of conservation projects to be done with some of the remaining money (\$2.6 for acquisition, and \$2.8 for studies), 38.6% conservation, which leaves 34% restoration.

Carrie said that if we go back to the normal way of business with projects in our region, it will be harder to sell next year as projects will be less and less developed. Question: Isn't it based on three-year implementation plans? Richard: If the Partnership continues, they could change the funding structure. If we have a lot of concepts and no projects, what will projects be next year? Richard: What is the strategy that makes sense to move a project down? Doris: At this point, she is happy with list, but if the citizen group wants to flip, it's OK with her. Hans: looks alright, but personally wants to see Tarboo-Dabob funded since it offers the opportunity to create a nearshore environment unique in the Hood Canal and it could go away if property developed and bulkhead stayed. He agrees with Peter, and is nervous about putting that much money into one project sponsor; but doesn't want to suggest moving an assessment project down unless project sponsor who is familiar with it speaks to it. Jeff, keep list as is OK with citizen committee review process.

Peter: Port Townsend Bay shoreline and Tarboo-Dabob would have been close to the top of the list if not for one mile criteria, which took 10 points off so he has a problem with the process criteria and affect on range of projects; Tarboo-Dabob has committed match and Port Townsend doesn't right now. Hans: The downside is if they can't get this grant, it makes it more difficult to get another. Richard: PT Bay is more valuable to salmon and also time sensitive. Peter disagrees because they have more time to get grants together. He proposes Port Townsend be moved below Tarboo-Dabob. The technical reasons are as Peter stated previously. Jeff: Tarboo-Dabob has a lot of community support but so will Port Townsend. Mark's opinion of the list is that it's generally good with a few minor exceptions (Vance Creek shouldn't be below the Big Quilcene if it did come down). Micah: Overall, but problems with Pope and Salmon Snow because there should be regulations protecting those already; it's a broken system. Port Townsend and Tarboo-Dabob should both be funded since they are similar.

Richard: In summary we're comfortable where we are with the list generally, though we don't have consensus in a couple areas. Peter again stated he wanted to switch because of certainty of success and two-month purchase deadline. Jeff is OK with switching. It was noted that three people think it should be switched. Hans would like more information. Micah: The purchase of sale time constraint is valid and he can buy into it. Richard said protecting Port Townsend Bay for 50 houses outweighs the Tarboo-Dabob project and it's his opinion that they will both get funded, but from a technical standpoint it should stand. Mike: it's a decent argument, but if both will be funded, why not put the one in front of the other that has risk and uncertainty. Hans is convinced as well. Richard is focused on recovery plan and strategy. Peter: you could cut these projects back \$100,000 and not take away the scope of work. There was further general discussion of the impact of 50 more homes and affect on salmon habitat. More people want to move it and Richard and Carrie have to go with consensus or vote. Carrie thinks stated benefits to salmon were higher for Port Townsend Bay. How do we know the bulkhead will affect the drift cells and how much sediment do you have to take out to affect the system?

It was clear that the TAG would not reach consensus on the topic of transposing Tarboo-Dabob and Port Townsend Bay. Richard thus was forced to propose taking a vote. There are seven members present (minus one who could not vote given it was their project), three for not moving, four for moving. **Thus, the technical committee agreed to move the Tarboo-Dabob Bay project above the Port Townsend Bay shoreline project.**

The group agreed the list should be approved down to the Noxious Weeds with one exception. **The TAG proposed and accepted moving Big Quilcene LWD to 21 on the list following Port Townsend Bay Shoreline project.**

A member of the TAG proposed moving the Marine Riparian Initiative ahead of WRIA 16 BMP Implementation given the benefits to salmon, which was agreed on by unanimous consent. A recommendation was made that noxious weed surveys change of scope to focus on one or two watersheds and inventorying and treating them wholistically. Richard will work with them to narrow down to get funded.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Final Technical Rank	Project Name	Sponsor
1	Skokomish Estuary Island Restoration	Skokomish
2	WDFW Big Quilcene Estuarine Dike Removal	HCSEG
3	Pope Headwaters Conservation	CLC
4	Nearshore Juvenile Salmon Assessment	HCCC
5	Upper South Fork Skokomish LWD Phase 2	Skokomish
6	Right Smart Cove Acquisition and Restoration	WFC
7	Ward Property Acquisition in Quilcene Bay	HCSEG
8	Salmon Estuary Wood Waste Removal	NOSC
9	Snow/Salmon Riparian 2007	JCCD
10	Duckabush Robinson Road Levee Removal	HCSEG

11	Skokomish General Investigation	Skokomish
12	Lower Dosewallips Estuary and Floodplain Restoration	WFC
13	Mid-Hood Canal Acquisition	Jefferson County
14	Dosewallips & Duckabush Engineered Log Jam Design	WFC
15	Skokomish Confluence Reach Restoration Design	Skokomish
16	Vance Creek Design	Skokomish
17	Five Mile Creek LWD	MCD
18	Chimacum Creek S-Curve Conservation	JLT
19	Tarboo-Dabob Bay Acquisition and Restoration	NWI
20	Port Townsend Bay Shoreline Acquisition	WA State Parks
21	Big Quilcene LWD Phase 2	Skokomish
22	Skokomish Knotweed Inventory and Treatment	MCD
23	Noxious Weed Survey for Lower and Mid-HC	HCSEG
24	Marine Riparian Initiative	HCCC
25	WRIA 16 BMP Implementation	MCD
26	Twanoh Falls Community Club Bulkhead Removal	HCSEG